



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
KIVA - CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
APPROVED STUDY SESSION MINUTES**

PRESENT: Wayne Ecton, Council Member
Michael D'Andrea, Development Member
Jeremy A. Jones, Design Member
Kevin O'Neill, Development Member
Michael Schmitt, Design Member
Jeffery Schwartz, Commission Member

ABSENT: E.L. Cortez, Vice-Chairman

STAFF: Donna Bronksi
Mac Cummins
Lusia Galav
Sherry Scott
Greg Williams

CALL TO ORDER

The study session of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Osterman at 12:34 p.m.

REVIEW DRB CASES

Ms. Galav reviewed the following agendized cases:

CONTINUANCES

3. 100-DR-2005 Main Street Plaza - Building Improvements

Continued until the first meeting in January.

CONSENT AGENDA

4. 70-DR-2004 The Park @ Scottsdale Mall

No questions or comments presented.

5. 85-DR-2005 Pacific Realty Advisors

APPROVED 01/05/2006 - bdf

Mr. Cummins presented material boards for the Board's review.

In response to inquiries by Board Member O'Neill, Mr. Cummins confirmed that no photos are currently contained in the file. Mr. Cummins reported that the massing and the form of the building are consistent with the developments occurring along the street as well as the Downtown Design Guidelines.

Commissioner Schwartz noted concerns regarding the colors and the theme of the building. Noting the lack of context photos pertaining to the area, he requested that the case be removed from the consent agenda.

Mr. Cummins noted that the Applicant would be present at the regular meeting to address questions posed by the Board.

Ms. Galav recommended that the Applicant address the project at the regular meeting.

Board Member Schmitt noted the lack of floor plans in the packet.

Councilman Ecton noted the consensus of the Board to move the item to the regular agenda for presentation by the Applicant.

6. 87-DR-2005 Lowe's Home Improvement

Commissioner Schwartz noted a number of concerns pertaining to the project and suggested that the case be moved to the regular agenda for discussion.

Board Member D'Andrea opined that the proposed project is one of the nicest Lowe's centers he has seen to date and the Applicant has done a great job.

In response to inquiry by Board Member Schmitt regarding Stipulation number 12, reducing the drive isles from 25 feet to 24 feet, and Stipulation number 14, Mr. Cummins explained that the drive isles on the site plan are mislabeled by a foot. Staff agrees that four feet is slightly narrower than desired for pedestrian connections. However, four feet is the maximum size the drive isles could be made without losing at least one-half of one row of parking.

Board Member Jones commented that overall the center came together fine, but suggested that the Applicant review the gray, Opera House color and consider using a warmer color or a cooler color as shown in the prints. He opined that either color would improve the overall effect of the color.

Councilman Ecton suggested moving the case to the regular agenda for further discussion.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Ms. Galav noted information presented to the Board regarding the duties and responsibilities of the Development Review Board. A study is being performed related to all of the Boards and Commissions and their duties and

responsibilities. Ms. Galav requested that Members review the information, note any changes or items for consideration to be discussed at the first meeting in January. If the Board then has recommendations for changes, such can be voted upon at the second meeting in January.

Board Member Jones noted some language that implies that City Council Members sitting on Boards do not have a vote. He noted that such is not the protocol of the DRB and the matter should be clearly stated, in writing, that in the specific case of the Development Review Board, that the City Council Member chairing the Board does have a vote. Ms. Bronski is currently reviewing the matter.

Board Member O'Neill noted the contradiction identified by Board Member Jones in Section 2-241. Paragraph B appears to possibly conflict with Section 1.903 paragraph A.

Upon conclusion of the Administrative Report, Councilman Ecton suggested further discussion regarding case number 85-DR-2005, Pacific Realty Advisors.

Mr. Cummins distributed context photos for review by Board Members. Mr. Sam West, Architect, 8160 North Hayden, Scottsdale, addressed the Board.

Commissioner Schwartz expressed favor for the colors and the appearance of the building, but noted concerns regarding the appearance of the rest of the street. He noted that his hesitation is in trying to understand what is occurring in the area.

Mr. West reported that the street is a conglomeration of various types of buildings. Commissioner Schwartz requested streetscape photos and posed the question of whether or not staff has decided what the street should ultimately look like.

Randy Grant noted that the 5th Avenue Craftsman Court area is not as sensitive from a design standpoint as Old Town in terms of establishing and maintaining a common theme along the streetscape. In fact, in the 5th Avenue area there has been some discussion about burying the streetscape to provide some interest, given that the street could look very similar. The buildings are not setback from the street the same way. Without some difference, it might have a bit more of a monotonous feel from the standpoint of a pedestrian. Mr. Grant noted that nothing exists outside of the Downtown Design Guidelines that specify the particulars for design. He noted that it really is up to the Development Review Board to determine whether or not a particular design is appropriate.

Commissioner Schwartz opined that a policy and guidelines need to be established for this area. He noted the importance of identifying the criteria for each particular area, which would enable the Board to feel confident in moving applications forward on that basis.

Mr. Grant suggested that staff take photographs of the area that can be viewed by Board Members during the regular meeting.

Mr. West reported having spoken with every merchant on Craftsman Court and the south end of 3rd Avenue, all of whom signed a petition in support of the project as well as the plans.

Commissioner Schwartz noted that his comments were not directed to Mr. West's design; his concerns relate to the extent of the context regarding what is to occur in the area.

Board Member Jones opined that the building almost looks like an entry to other buildings and questioned the use of such a strong primary red color. Mr. West explained that there are existing canopies on both sides of this building that project out as far as the balcony. The color is a result of long discussions about the future of the area and is a preference of the owner. The glass is a translucent glass and is a softer red in real life. The aluminum handrail system is going to support the glass. The only paving brick would be back on the property itself.

In response to inquiry by Board Member Schmitt, Mr. West confirmed that there is no lighting or signage involved with the translucent glass panels around the balcony. The only signage that will be on the building is the address.

Board Member Jones opined that the roof is not going to be visible in very many places and he does not see a need to carry the case onto the regular agenda.

In response to inquiries by Board Member D'Andrea regarding materials, Mr. West explained that the preference is to use core tin steel on the balcony fascia. Discussion ensued regarding the use of core tin steel and other material options.

Board Members Jones and D'Andrea strongly suggested the use of powder coating. Mr. West agreed.

Councilman Ecton noted that Board Members are reasonably comfortable with the project, with the exception of the uncertainty surrounding the undefined character of the area.

Upon inquiry by Councilman Ecton, Mr. Grant suggested that the best approach for determining and establishing the desired future context of the area would call for continuing the case, evaluating the context, and attempting to define the desired outcome.

Councilman Ecton was not in favor of holding up this project and identified that the greatest concern relates to future projects and the guidelines that the Development Review Board should be following. He requested additional comments from Board Members.

Board Member Schmitt commented that the area is very eclectic and does not have a specific or particular style. He opined that there is something charming about the fact that the area is eclectic and the different styles and character from building to building is not a negative thing in this context. He further opined that for the DRB to attempt to define a particular style for that area would then be like imposing development standards in a subdivision.

Commissioner Schwartz shared a different vision, opining that established design guidelines give more direction to developers. He opined that the 5th Avenue area has no context at all and the City is not giving it any direction. He expressed concern about approving a building prior to establishing the desired context of the area. He further opined that the case should be continued, a policy implemented pertaining to the desired context of 5th Avenue, and that the issue warrants further discussion.

Board Member Jones understands the concerns regarding the neighborhood. He agreed that developing further guidelines would be helpful, but in terms of this specific case, the size of the project does not warrant the case being delayed pending further study of the neighborhood.

Ms. Galav recommended that the study session be adjourned and discussions regarding this matter be continued to the regular meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Whereupon, the study session of the Development Review Board adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
A/V Tronics, Inc.